



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,831	10/11/2001	Kamal Acharya	NETS0085	3000
22862	7590	09/04/2007	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP			DUNHAM, JASON B	
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L			ART UNIT	
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			PAPER NUMBER	
			3625	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/975,831

Applicant(s)

ACHARYA ET AL.

Examiner

Jason B. Dunham

Art Unit

3625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jason B. Dunham.

(3) _____.

(2) Chris Peil.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pricescan (See pto-892 dated June 20, 2006 and Biswas (US 6,594,666)).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Chris Peil, attorney of record for the application, indicated that he did not believe the combination of Pricescan and Biswas disclosed the limitation of distinguishing online from offline providers. Examiner Dunham indicated that it was inherent from Pricescan that online and offline providers were distinguished but would review Mr. Peil's position upon formal filing of remarks.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required